

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-7 and 9-14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 5 and 9 are amended for better clarity and to incorporate the subject matter recited in claim 2. Claims 5 and 9 are rewritten in independent form. Claims 6, 7, 11 and 12 are amended in view of the amendments to claims 1 and 5. New claims 13 and 14 are added to depend from claim 9 and to recite similar subject matter recited in claims 10 and 11, respectively.

Claims 2-4 and 8 are canceled.

Reconsideration of the application in light of the foregoing claim amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent Publication 2005/0073627 to Akiyama ("Akiyama"). This rejection is moot with respect to the canceled claim 2, and is respectfully traversed with respect to claims 1 and 6.

The Office Action asserts that Akiyama discloses all elements recited in claim 1. However, Akiyama does not disclose a second liquid crystal element that is partially disposed over a major surface of the light conductive plate, the second liquid crystal element covering one area, but not covering another area, of the major surface of the light conductive plate, as recited in claim 1.

Akiyama discloses a device having a light conductive plate 112 and a second liquid crystal element 102. See Figs. 1 and 6 and paragraphs 71 and 72. The second liquid crystal element 102 completely covers the lower major surface of the conductive plate 112. Thus, Akiyama does not disclose a second liquid crystal element that is partially disposed over a major surface of the light conductive plate, the second liquid crystal element covering one area, but not covering another area, of the major surface of the light conductive plate, as recited in claim 1.

Also, Akiyama does not disclose a second liquid crystal element that has a smaller display screen size than a first liquid crystal display element, as recited in claim 1. In particular, Akiyama discloses a device having the first liquid crystal element 502 and the second liquid crystal element 102. See Figs. 5 and 6 and paragraphs 71 and 72. The first and second liquid crystal elements 502 and 102 provide the same display screen size. Therefore, Akiyama does not disclose a second liquid crystal element that has a smaller display screen size than the first liquid crystal display element, as recited in claim 1.

Additionally, Akiyama does not disclose a reflector plate, as recited in claim 1. In particular, Akiyama discloses a transflective reflector 120. See Figs. 5 and 6, and paragraphs 71 and 72. The transflective reflector 120 is an optical element like a half mirror that has no polarizing capability and serves to transmit a portion of light incident thereon and reflect the remainder of the light. See paragraph 72. Such a transflective reflector is not a reflector plate. Therefore, Akiyama does not disclose a reflector plate, as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, Akiyama does not disclose a reflector plate partially disposed on a major surface of the light conductive plate having the second liquid crystal display element, the reflector plate covering an area of the major surface that is not covered by the second liquid crystal display element, the reflector plate not covering an area of the major surface that is covered by the second liquid crystal display element, as recited in claim 1. In particular, Akiyama discloses a transflective reflector 120. See Fig. 6 and paragraph 72. The transflective reflector 120 completely covers the lower major surface of the light conductive plate 112. Thus, Akiyama does not disclose a reflector plate partially disposed at a major surface of the light conductive plate having the second liquid crystal display element, the reflector plate covering an area of the major surface that is not covered by the second liquid crystal display element, the reflector plate not covering an area of the major surface that is covered by the second liquid crystal display element, as recited in claim 1.

In addition, regarding claim 6, Akiyama does not disclose a reflector plate that has its reflectance matched with reflectance of the second liquid crystal display element. In particular, Akiyama discloses a transflective reflector 120. See Fig. 6 and paragraph 72. It appears that the rate of light 705 to light 703 is the same as the rate of light 707 to light 706. However, Akiyama does not disclose a reflection rate of the second liquid crystal element 102, much less a feature that such a rate is the same as that of the transflective reflector 120. Therefore, Akiyama does not disclose a reflector plate that has its reflectance matched with reflectance of the second liquid crystal display element, as recited in claim 6.

For any or all of the above reasons, Akiyama does not disclose each and every element recited in claims 1 and 6. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 3-5 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Akiyama in view of U.S. Patent 6,529,250 to Murakami et al. ("Murakami"); rejects claims 7, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Akiyama in view of Murakami, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,243,150 to Watanabe et al. ("Watanabe"); and rejects claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Akiyama in view of Murakami, and U.S. Patent 6,443,585 to Saccomanno ("Saccomanno"). These rejections are moot with respect to canceled claims 3, 4 and 8, and are respectfully traversed with respect to the remaining claims.

As discussed above, Akiyama does not disclose or suggest a second liquid crystal display element that has a smaller display screen size than the first liquid crystal display element, and that is partially disposed over a major surface of the light conductive plate, the second liquid crystal display element covering one area, but not covering another area of the major surface of the light conductive plate, as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 5 and 9; a reflector plate partially disposed at the major surface of the light conductive plate having the second liquid crystal display element, the reflector plate covering an area of

the major surface that is not covered by the second liquid crystal display element, the reflector plate not covering an area of the major surface that is covered by the second liquid crystal display element, as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 5 and 9; or a reflector plate that has its reflectance matched with reflectance of the second liquid crystal display element, as recited in claims 6 and 10. Murakami, Watanabe and Saccomanno do not supply the subject matter lacking in Akiyama. Thus, Akiyama, Murakami, Watanabe and Saccomanno, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1, 5, 6 and 9, and claims 7 and 10-12 depending therefrom.

Furthermore, the applied references do not appear to disclose or suggest a reflector plate that has its reflectance gradually varying at a given area close to the second liquid crystal display element, as recited in claims 7, 11 and 12. In particular, the Office Action asserts that Watanabe discloses an uneven portion 4H that has its reflectance gradually varying at a given area close to the liquid crystal display area 2. See Fig. 6, col. 8, lines 21-39, and col. 9, lines 11-18 of Watanabe. However, the uneven portion 4H is provided on a lower surface of substrate 4A that corresponds to a light conductive plate. Watanabe does not disclose or suggest an uneven portion that is provided on a reflector plate. Therefore, Watanabe does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 7, 11 and 12.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5-7 and 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

New claims 13 and 14 are believed to be patentable at least in view of the patentability of claim 9, from which they depend, as well as for additional features they recite.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 5-7 and 9-14 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Gang Luo
Registration No. 50,559

JAO:GXL/sqb

Date: November 23, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461